JS 44 (Rev. 10/20)

### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDAN	TS					
Jacqueline Allen-Fillmore				Transportation Security Administration						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Kent County. DE  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Alexandria County. VA  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Numbe	er)		Attorneys (If Kno	wn)					
Neuwirth Law O	ffice, LLC, 2200 Re	naissance Blvd,								
Suite 270, King	of Prussia, PA 1940	6; 215-259-3687								
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF (For Diversity Cases Of		NCIPA		Place an "X" in and One Box for i		
U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	Not a Party)	Citiz	en of This State	PTF	DEF	Incorporated or Pri	incipal Place	PTF 4	DEI 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	<b>X</b> 2	<b>X</b> 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		5	
-			100	en or Subject of a reign Country	<u></u> 3	<u></u> 3	Foreign Nation		<u> </u>	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT							for: Nature of S			
CONTRACT  110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise  REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITIO  Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence  530 General  535 Death Penalty Other:  540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights  555 Prison Condition  560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of	1	CABOR  DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF PROPERTY 21 USC 8 10 Other  LABOR  DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY 21 USC 8 10 Other  LABOR  DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF	881	422 App 423 Wit 28  PROPE 820 Cop 830 Pate 835 Pate Nev 840 Trac 880 Def Act  SOCIA 861 HIA 862 Blac 863 DIV 864 SSI 865 RSI  FEDER 870 Tax or I 871 IRS	USC 157  RTY RIGHTS  Dyrights  ent ent - Abbreviated v Drug Application	375 False C 376 Qui Ta 3729(a 400 State F 410 Antitr 430 Banks 450 Comm 460 Deport 470 Racket Corrup 480 Consu 485 Teleph Protec 490 Cable/ 850 Securit Excha 890 Other a 891 Agricu 893 Enviro 895 Freedo Act 896 Arbitra 899 Admin Act/Re Agenc 950 Consti	m (31 USC i)) leapportion ist and Bankin erce ation eer Influen t Organizal mer Credit SC 1681 or one Consu tion Act Sat TV ies/Comm nge Stat Uses/Comm istrative Altural Acts nmental M m of Infon tion istrative Pi view or Aly y Decision	mment mg meed an meed an meer meer meer meer meer meet meer meet meet
	moved from 3	Confinement  Remanded from Appellate Court			nsferred		6 Multidistri		Litigatio	on -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON Brief description of ca	atute under which you a nuse: Defendants in this slip a		Do not cite jurisdictiona	ecify) I statute:	s unless di	Transfer		Direct F	ile
				EMAND S			HECK YES only URY DEMAND:	if demanded in	n complai	
VIII. RELATED CASS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		William State of the State of t		DOCK	ET NUMBER			) G
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY (	OF REGORD						
4/25/2022		/s/ Andrew Neuwirth	d	40						111.30
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY  RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDG	E		MAG. JUE	OGE		

### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JACQUELINE ALLEN-FILLMORE

144 Pine Street : CIVIL ACTION NO.

Plaintiff :

.

:

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY : JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

ADMINISTRATION

601 South 12th Street - TSA 9

Arlington, VA 20598-6009 :

and

v.

PHILADELPHIA INTERNATIONAL

AIRPORT
c/o City of Philadelphia

1515 Arch Street, 14th Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19102 and

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

1515 Arch Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor : Philadelphia, PA 19102 :

and :

JOHN DOE (S) : Defendants :

### **CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT**

#### **PARTIES**

- 1. Plaintiff Jacqueline Allen-Fillmore (herein referred to as "Plaintiff") is an adult individual residing at the above listed address in the State of Delaware.
- 2. Defendant Transportation Security Administration (hereinafter referred to as "TSA") is an agency of the United States Department of Homeland Security with its principal place of business and claims offices located at 601 South 12<sup>th</sup> Street TSA 9, Arlington, VA 20598.

- 3. Defendant Philadelphia International Airport (hereinafter referred to as "PHL") is owned by the City of Philadelphia with offices located in the City's Law Department Claims Division, 1515 Arch Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19107.
- 4. Defendant City of Philadelphia (hereinafter "Defendant City"), was and is a first class city and public entity located within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with offices located in the Law Department Claims Division, 1515 Arch Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19107.
- 5. Defendant John Doe(s) is or may be a maintenance company or companies or corporations subcontracted or otherwise under contract by or for the City of Philadelphia to maintain the inside areas, specifically the floors, of Philadelphia International Airport in a safe manner for passersby and travelers.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 6. Jurisdiction and venue are proper in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania because this Court has exclusive jurisdiction over claims against the United States for money damages and/or personal injury caused by the negligent acts or omissions of any employee of the Government acting within the scope of their office or employment under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the Plaintiff in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred. 28 USC § 1346 (b)(1).
- 7. Additionally, this Court has original diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 for the following reasons:
  - a. Plaintiff is a resident and citizen of the State of Delaware;
  - b. Defendants are political entities and agencies of the Federal Government and of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

- c. The acts and omissions giving rise to this action occurred in Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania;
- d. This Court has jurisdiction over events occurring in Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania;
- e. The amount in controversy exceeds seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000.00), exclusive of interest and costs.
- 8. Plaintiff has satisfied her duties and responsibilities under the Federal Tort Claims

  Act and has exhausted her remedies as demonstrated in the annexed Exhibit A.
- 9. More than six months has passed since the notice of claim was presented to the Federal Government.
  - 10. No representative of the TSA has ever contacted the Plaintiff or her counsel.
- 11. As a result, Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies and is entitled to file this lawsuit.

### **FACTUAL AVERMENTS**

- 12. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 13. On or about January 15, 2021, at approximately 9:30 a.m., Plaintiff was a business invitee at Philadelphia International Airport and possessed all the rights of a lawful business invitee.
- 14. On the above date, Plaintiff traveled to PHL in order to fly to North Carolina to visit her family.
  - 15. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff was lawfully upon the premises of PHL.
  - 16. Plaintiff was required to pass through a TSA checkpoint.

- 17. Plaintiff approached the TSA security checkpoint located at Terminal D in PHL.
- 18. Plaintiff removed her shoes to comply with TSA security regulations for airline passengers.
  - 19. Plaintiff was only wearing socks on her feet.
- 20. Plaintiff was processed by TSA officers through the luggage scan and body scan areas at the checkpoint.
- 21. Plaintiff was then caused to slip and fall on the slippery floor, a dangerous condition, located at TSA's checkpoint, and sustained serious injuries as more fully described below.
- 22. Defendants TSA, PHL, City of Philadelphia, and John Doe Corporation (s) are each individually, jointly, and severally responsible for the safety of business invitees such as Ms. Fillmore, when they are required to walk in their socks on the slippery airport and checkpoint floor.
  - 23. The floor at the TSA checkpoint was covered at various locations by rubber mats.
- 24. Upon information and belief, the rubber mats were not provided to avoid business invitees from slipping and falling.
  - 25. Upon information and belief, the mats were placed in a haphazard manner.
- 26. Upon information and belief, the mats were placed in various locations at the discretion of one or more TSA employees.
- 27. Upon information and belief, the mats did not cover the entirety of the slippery floor, where invitees would be expected to walk in their socks before retrieving their shoes.
- 28. Upon information and belief, the mats were placed to facilitate screening of passengers and not for the safety of the passengers.

- 29. Upon information and belief, the marble-type floors at the checkpoint were slippery whether due to foreign substances spilled on them or due to the manner in which they were created and maintained.
- 30. Upon information and belief, no warnings were placed advising passengers of the slippery floor conditions.
- 31. Upon information and belief, the floors at the checkpoint were not treated with a readily available commercial non-stick coating to prevent passengers from slipping while they were negotiating the checkpoint in socks.
- 32. Upon information and belief, the floors at the checkpoint were regularly inundated with spills of various substances from passengers.
- 33. Upon information and belief, the floors at the checkpoint were not properly cleaned and maintained in a regular and timely manner by the Defendants.
- 34. Upon information and belief, the floors at the checkpoint were serviced by the Defendants in such a manner as to increase the risk that passengers would slip on the floors, while they were in their socks.
- 35. Upon information and belief, no effort was made to avoid spills or slippery substances remaining on the slippery marble-type floors at the checkpoint.
- 36. Upon information and belief, the Defendants had a duty to investigate whether the marble-type flooring at PHL was a slipping hazard for passengers walking in their socks.
- 37. Following the 2006 Robert Reid "shoe bomber" incident, all travelers were required to remove their shoes at TSA checkpoints.

- 38. At that point, upon information and belief, the Defendants were placed on notice and knew or should have known that the marble-type flooring presented a slipping hazard for passengers wearing only socks on their feet at security checkpoints.
- 39. Upon information and belief, the marble-type flooring, its maintenance, and slippery characteristics were not addressed or altered in response to TSA's requirement that passengers walk on the flooring in their stocking feet.
- 40. Despite knowledge of the above, the Defendants required business invitees to navigate the dangerous slippery marble-type floors of the TSA screening areas in their sock-clad feet, knowing full well that passengers were exposed to a risk of slipping and falling and injuring themselves.

# COUNT I JACQUELINE ALLEN-FILLMORE v. TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (Negligence)

- 41. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 42. The security checkpoint maintained by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) was staffed with Transportation Security Officers (TSO's).
- 43. Congress created the TSA after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, with the enactment of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, Pub. L. No. 107-71, 115 Stat. 597 (2001).
- 44. Under that Act, TSOs perform screenings at TSA checkpoints in airports in the United States. See 49 U.S.C. § 44901(a).

- 45. At all times material hereto, Defendant TSA did own, possess, control, operate, supervise, maintain, and/or was responsible for allowing a dangerous condition to exist at its checkpoint, where Plaintiff was caused to slip and fall and sustain those injuries described below.
- 46. Upon information and belief, Defendant TSA did own, possess, control, operate, supervise, maintain, and/or was otherwise responsible for the condition of the floor located at or near its security checkpoint.
- 47. TSA and its agents are liable for personal injury caused by the negligent acts or omissions of any employee of the Government acting within the scope of their office or employment under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the Plaintiff in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred. 28 USC § 1346 (b)(1).
- 48. Here, were TSA a private business whose invitees were falling on its dangerous flooring, the business would be liable in tort to the Plaintiff. The above statute dictates that TSA is similarly liable to the Plaintiff as any business owner would be for the negligent conduct described herein.
- 49. TSA owed a duty to Plaintiff and all passengers to make sure through investigation, maintenance, surveillance, and supervision that the checkpoint could be navigated safely by passengers wearing socks.
  - 50. TSA breached that duty by failing to warn the Plaintiff of the slippery flooring.
- 51. TSA breached that duty by failing to make sure that all areas of the checkpoint, where passengers would be in socks, were covered in rubber or other non-skid or slip resistant material.

- 52. TSA breached its duty to Plaintiff by failing to make sure that the marble-like flooring at its Checkpoint was coated with a non-stick coating.
- 53. TSA breached its duty to Plaintiff by failing to make sure that all areas of the checkpoint, where passengers would be in socks, covered entirely by rubber non-slip floor mats.
- 54. TSA breached its duty to Plaintiff by haphazardly placing rubber floor mats that were intended for the benefit of the TSA personnel or to enhance screening, but ignored the safety of the plaintiff and other invitees.
- 55. The aforementioned incident was the result of the negligence of the TSA and its agents, servants, workmen, and/or employees and was due in no manner whatsoever to any act or failure to act on the part of Plaintiff.
- 56. Defendant TSA knew or in the exercise, of reasonable care should have known of the slippery floor.
- 57. Defendant TSA had a duty to inspect, maintain, warn of and/or otherwise correct the dangerous condition of the slippery floor.
- 58. Defendant TSA breached its duty to the Plaintiff and Plaintiff was injured as a result.
- 59. At all pertinent times, Defendant TSA acted by and through its respective agents, employees, servants, and/or workmen who were acting within the course and scope of their employment and authority.
- 60. The aforementioned incident and the resulting injuries and/or damages sustained by Plaintiff directly and proximately resulted from the negligence of TSA, which conduct consisted of, but was not limited to, the following:
  - a. failing to place a mat or non-skid material along the entire course of the checkpoint where business invitees would walk in their socks;

- b. failing to prevent pedestrians from walking in the area where the dangerous condition existed;
- c. failing to warn the Plaintiff of the hazardous condition and/or otherwise dangerous condition;
- d. failing to detect or recognize the existence of a dangerous condition in a highly trafficked area;
- e. failing to correct or otherwise remedy the aforesaid dangerous/hazardous condition after being put on notice of same;
- f. failing to maintain the premises and keep it in a safe condition so as not to constitute a snare, trap, obstruction, hazard or impediment to its visitors and people such as Plaintiff lawfully walking on the premises;
- g. failing to properly and adequately inspect said area to ascertain the existence of the dangerous and hazardous condition which existed;
- h. failing to properly and adequately correct the hazardous, dangerous and unsafe condition of the area;
- i. failing to exercise due care under the circumstances;
- j. being otherwise negligent as may more fully be revealed during discovery or at the time of trial of this matter;
- k. disregarding the rights, safety, and the position of the Plaintiff, who was a business invitee and failing to use the required degree of due care;
- l. failing to maintain the premises used by pedestrians in a condition that would protect and safeguard persons such as the Plaintiff lawfully situated thereon:
- 61. As a direct and proximate result of the fall, Plaintiff suffered serious and permanent impairment of a bodily function, serious bodily injuries requiring medical care and treatment, including, but not limited to:
  - a. Fracture of the right knee at the tibial plateau requiring surgery;
  - b. Scarring of the knee following surgery;
  - c. Arthritis of the right knee;
  - d. Pain including a severe shock to her nerves and nervous system and injury to her cervical, thoracic and lumbar spine, and more particularly as

- detailed by her physicians, including neurological damage as well as physical pain;
- e. Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer in the future great pain and agony all of which appear to be permanent in nature;
- f. The need for rehabilitation of various parts of her body;
- g. Such other pain, damages and losses as will be revealed in Plaintiff's medical records.
- 62. As a direct result of the fall, Plaintiff has been unable to undertake her usual and customary duties and activities and believes that she will continue to suffer impairments and disabilities into the future.
- 63. As a direct result of the fall, Plaintiff was forced to miss extended time from her usual activities.
- 64. As a further result of the fall, Plaintiff has or may be obliged to receive and undergo reasonable and necessary medical treatments and rehabilitative services for the injuries she suffered and may be obliged to expend such sums or to incur such expenditures for an indefinite time in the future.
- 65. As a direct and proximate result of the tortious conduct of TSA, Plaintiff has suffered and in the future will continue to suffer great pain, agony, and a diminution of her ability to enjoy life and life's pleasures, including but not limited to permanent impairment of her bodily functions.
- 66. As a further result of the tortious conduct of Defendant TSA as described above, Plaintiff has been and may in the future be compelled to expend a large sum of money for physicians, imaging, tests, monitoring, physical therapy, and the like, in an effort to cure herself of her injuries and/or suffering, which were brought about as a result of the incident.
  - 67. All of Plaintiff's injuries, damages and/or losses may be permanent in nature.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Jacqueline Fillmore respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in her favor and against Defendant Transportation Security Administration an amount in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00), in compensatory, economic, and non-economic damages, in addition to other damages permitted by law.

# COUNT II JACQUELINE ALLEN- FILLMORE v. PHILADELPHIA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT and CITY OF PHILADELPHIA (Negligence)

- 68. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 69. At all times material hereto, the City of Philadelphia and PHL did own, possess, control, operate, supervise, and maintain the flooring at its TSA security checkpoint in Terminal D, where Plaintiff was caused to slip and fall and sustain permanent injuries, as described below.
- 70. At all times material hereto, the City of Philadelphia and PHL were responsible for allowing a dangerous condition to exist at the TSA security Checkpoint.
- 71. Upon information and belief, PHL had both actual and constructive notice of the dangerous condition of its real property.
- 72. Upon information and belief, PHL had been on notice of the dangerous and defective condition of its flooring for an extended period of time and a sufficient period of time to remedy the dangerous condition.
- 73. Following the shoe bomber incident, PHL had ample time in which to apply a slip-resistant coating to PHL's floors and failed to do so.
- 74. As a result, PHL's floors were defective in that their slipperiness presented a known and unavoidable hazard to business invitees.

- 75. The City of Philadelphia was required to investigate this defective condition and should have been aware that multiple slip resistant solutions existed for floors such as those in use by TSA at PHL, but failed to take such measures to make passengers safe.
- 76. The City of Philadelphia and PHL were responsible for the safe condition of the flooring located at Terminal D by security checkpoint.
- 77. The aforementioned incident was the result of the negligence of the Defendants City of Philadelphia and/or PHL and was due in no manner whatsoever to any act or failure to act on the part of Plaintiff.
- 78. Defendant PHL knew or in the exercise, of reasonable care should have known that the floor at the security checkpoints was slippery and posed a danger or passengers wearing only socks on their feet.
- 79. Defendant PHL had a duty to inspect, maintain, warn of and/or otherwise correct the condition of the slippery floor.
- 80. PHL did not warn the Plaintiff or other passengers of the dangerous slipperiness of the flooring that they were forced to walk over.
- 81. Defendant PHL breached its duty to the Plaintiff and Plaintiff was injured as a result.
- 82. At all pertinent times, Defendant PHL acted by and through its respective agents, employees, servants, and/or workmen, who were acting within the course and scope of their employment and authority.
- 83. The aforementioned incident and the resulting injuries and/or damages sustained by Plaintiff directly and proximately resulted from the negligence of PHL and the City of Philadelphia, which conduct consisted of, but was not limited to, the following:

- a. failing to place a mat or non-skid material along the entire course of the checkpoint where business invitees would walk in their socks;
- b. failing to prevent pedestrians from walking in the area where the dangerous condition existed;
- c. failing to warn the Plaintiff of the hazardous condition and/or otherwise dangerous condition;
- d. failing to detect or recognize the existence of a dangerous condition in a highly trafficked area;
- e. failing to correct or otherwise remedy the aforesaid dangerous/hazardous condition after being put on notice of same;
- f. failing to maintain the premises and keep it in a safe condition so as not to constitute a snare, trap, obstruction, hazard or impediment to its visitors and people such as Plaintiff lawfully walking on the premises;
- g. failing to properly and adequately inspect said area to ascertain the existence of the dangerous and hazardous condition which existed;
- h. failing to properly and adequately correct the hazardous, dangerous and unsafe condition of the area;
- i. failing to exercise due care under the circumstances;
- j. being otherwise negligent as may more fully be revealed during discovery or at the time of trial of this matter;
- k. disregarding the rights, safety, and the position of the Plaintiff, who was a business invitee and failing to use the required degree of due care;
- 1. failing to maintain the premises used by pedestrians in a condition that would protect and safeguard persons such as the Plaintiff lawfully situated thereon;
- 84. As a direct and proximate result of the fall, Plaintiff suffered serious and permanent impairment of a bodily function, serious bodily injuries requiring medical care and treatment, including, but not limited to:
  - a. Fracture of the right knee at the tibial plateau requiring surgery;
  - b. Scarring of the knee following surgery;
  - c. Arthritis of the right knee;

- d. Pain including a severe shock to her nerves and nervous system and injury to her cervical, thoracic and lumbar spine, and more particularly as detailed by her physicians, including neurological damage as well as physical pain;
- e. Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer in the future great pain and agony all of which appear to be permanent in nature;
- f. The need for rehabilitation of various parts of her body.
- 85. Such other pain, damages and losses as will be revealed in Plaintiff's medical records.
- 86. As a direct result of the fall, Plaintiff has been unable to undertake her usual and customary duties and activities since the accident and believes that she will continue to suffer impairments and disabilities into the future.
- 87. As a direct result of the fall, Plaintiff was forced to miss extended time from her usual activities.
- 88. As a further result of the fall, Plaintiff has or may be obliged to receive and undergo reasonable and necessary medical treatments and rehabilitative services for the injuries she suffered and may be obliged to expend such sums or to incur such expenditures for an indefinite time in the future.
- 89. As a direct and proximate result of the tortious conduct of Defendant PHL,

  Plaintiff has suffered and in the future will continue to suffer great pain, agony, and a diminution

  of her ability to enjoy life and life's pleasures, including but not limited to serious impairment of
  her bodily functions.
- 90. As a further result of the tortious conduct of Defendant PHL as described above, Plaintiff has been and will in the future be compelled to expend a large sum of money for physicians, surgery, imaging, tests, monitoring, physical therapy, and the like, in an effort to

permanently and thoroughly cure herself of her injuries and/or suffering, which were brought about as a result of the incident.

- 91. As further result of the tortious conduct of Defendant PHL, Plaintiff has incurred in the past and will incur into the future other financial expenses or losses, which do or will exceed the amount which she may be otherwise entitled to recover.
- 92. As a further result of the tortious conduct of Defendant PHL, Plaintiff has become unable to perform her usual and customary activities in the manner to which she was accustomed before this accident.
  - 93. All of Plaintiff's injuries, damages and losses are or may be permanent in nature.
- 94. A Tort Claims Notice was sent to the City of Philadelphia on April 8, 2021, which is annexed hereto as Exhibit B.
- 95. A Tort Claims Notice was sent to PHL on May 14, 2021, which is annexed hereto as Exhibit C.
- 96. Liability against the Defendant is imposed by virtue of 42 Pa. C.S. 8542(b)(3), et seq. and specifically the real property exception to the Governmental Immunity Political Subdivision Tort Claims Act.
- 97. Plaintiff sustained a permanent injury and permanent impairment of a bodily function in her affected knee.
  - 98. Plaintiff expended over \$5,000.00 (five thousand dollars) in medical bills.
  - 99. Plaintiff suffers from permanent scarring due to the injury she suffered.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Jacqueline Allen-Fillmore respectfully requests that this

Honorable Court enter judgment in her favor and against Defendants, Philadelphia International

Airport and City of Philadelphia, in an amount in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars

(\$75,000.00), in compensatory, economic, and non-economic damages, in addition to other damages permitted by law.

## <u>COUNT III</u> <u>JACQUELINE ALLEN-FILLMORE v. JOHN DOE (S)</u> (Negligence)

- 100. The preceding paragraphs are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 101. Upon information and belief, Defendant John Doe(s) were independent contractors or corporations, which were responsible for the safe condition of the floor located at or near TSA checkpoints in Terminal D at PHL.
- 102. Defendant John Doe(s) owed a duty to Plaintiff and all passengers to make sure through investigation, maintenance, surveillance, and supervision that the checkpoint could be navigated safely by passengers wearing socks.
- 103. John Doe(s) breached that duty by failing to warn the Plaintiff of the slippery flooring.
- 104. John Doe(s) breached that duty by failing to be aware of the slippery flooring at the TSA security checkpoint.
- 105. John Doe(s) breached that duty by failing to properly and diligently clean and maintain the flooring at the TSA Checkpoints.
- 106. John Doe(s) breached that duty by failing to make sure that all areas of the checkpoint, where passengers would be in socks, were covered in rubber or other non-skid or slip resistant material.
- 107. John Doe(s) breached its duty to Plaintiff by failing to make sure that the marble-like flooring at its Checkpoint was coated with a non-skid coating or covered by rubber non-slip floor mats.

- 108. John Doe(s) breached its duty to Plaintiff by failing to make sure that all areas of the checkpoint, where passengers would be in socks, were covered in rubber mats, rather than selectively placing mats in a haphazard manner.
- 109. The aforementioned incident was the result of the negligence of the John Doe(s) and its agents, servants, workmen, and/or employees and was due in no manner whatsoever to any act or failure to act on the part of Plaintiff.
- 110. Defendant John Doe(s) knew or in the exercise, of reasonable care should have known of the slippery floor.
- 111. Defendant John Doe(s) had a duty to inspect, maintain, warn of and/or otherwise correct the dangerous condition of the slippery floor.
- 112. Defendant John Doe(s) breached its duty to the Plaintiff and Plaintiff was injured as a result.
- 113. At all pertinent times, Defendant John Doe(s) acted by and through its respective agents, employees, servants, and/or workmen who were acting within the course and scope of their employment and authority.
- 114. The aforementioned incident and the resulting injuries and/or damages sustained by Plaintiff directly and proximately resulted from the negligence of John Doe(s), which conduct consisted of, but was not limited to, the following:
  - a. failing to place a mat or non-skid material along the entire course of the checkpoint where business invitees would walk in their socks;
  - b. failing to prevent pedestrians from walking in the area where the dangerous condition existed;
  - c. failing to warn the Plaintiff of the hazardous condition and/or otherwise dangerous condition;

- d. failing to detect or recognize the existence of a dangerous condition in a highly trafficked area;
- e. failing to correct or otherwise remedy the aforesaid dangerous/hazardous condition after being put on notice of same;
- f. failing to maintain the premises and keep it in a safe condition so as not to constitute a snare, trap, obstruction, hazard or impediment to its visitors and people such as Plaintiff lawfully walking on the premises;
- g. failing to properly and adequately inspect said area to ascertain the existence of the dangerous and hazardous condition which existed;
- h. failing to properly and adequately correct the hazardous, dangerous and unsafe condition of the area;
- i. failing to exercise due care under the circumstances;
- j. being otherwise negligent as may more fully be revealed during discovery or at the time of trial of this matter;
- k. disregarding the rights, safety, and the position of the Plaintiff, who was a business invitee and failing to use the required degree of due care;
- 1. failing to maintain the premises used by pedestrians in a condition that would protect and safeguard persons such as the Plaintiff lawfully situated thereon;
- 115. As a direct and proximate result of the fall, Plaintiff suffered serious and permanent impairment of a bodily function, serious bodily injuries requiring medical care and treatment, including, but not limited to:
  - a. Fracture of the right knee at the tibial plateau requiring surgery;
  - b. Scarring of the knee following surgery;
  - c. Arthritis of the right knee;
  - d. Pain including a severe shock to her nerves and nervous system and injury to her cervical, thoracic and lumbar spine, and more particularly as detailed by her physicians, including neurological damage as well as physical pain;
  - e. Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer in the future great pain and agony all of which appear to be permanent in nature;

- f. The need for rehabilitation of various parts of her body;
- g. Such other pain, damages and losses as will be revealed in Plaintiff's medical records.
- 116. As a direct result of the fall, Plaintiff has been unable to undertake her usual and customary duties and activities and believes that she will continue to suffer impairments and disabilities into the future.
- 117. As a direct result of the fall, Plaintiff was forced to miss extended time from her usual activities.
- 118. As a further result of the fall, Plaintiff has or may be obliged to receive and undergo reasonable and necessary medical treatments and rehabilitative services for the injuries she suffered and may be obliged to expend such sums or to incur such expenditures for an indefinite time in the future.
- 119. As a direct and proximate result of the tortious conduct of John Doe(s), Plaintiff has suffered and in the future will continue to suffer great pain, agony, and a diminution of her ability to enjoy life and life's pleasures, including but not limited to permanent impairment of her bodily functions.
- 120. As a further result of the tortious conduct of Defendant John Doe(s) as described above, Plaintiff has been and may in the future be compelled to expend a large sum of money for physicians, imaging, tests, monitoring, physical therapy, and the like, in an effort to cure herself of her injuries and/or suffering, which were brought about as a result of the incident.
  - 121. All of Plaintiff's injuries, damages and/or losses may be permanent in nature.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Jacqueline Allen-Fillmore respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in her favor and against Defendant John Doe(s) in an amount in

excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00), in compensatory, economic, and non-economic damages, in addition to other damages permitted by law.

### **NEUWIRTH LAW OFFICE, LLC**

Date: 4/25/22 By: Andrew Neuwirth /s/

Andrew T. Neuwirth, Esquire

Attorney for Plaintiffs Atty. ID No. 310079

2200 Renaissance Blvd., Suite 270

King of Prussia, PA 19406

Tel: 215-259-3687 Fax: 215-253-5816

Email: andrew@neuwirthlaw.com

## **EXHIBIT A**



April 8, 2021

### Via fax (571) 227-1904 & Certified Mail

TSA Claims Management Branch 601 South 12<sup>th</sup> Street – TSA 9 Arlington, VA 20598-6009

RE: My Client:

Jacqueline Darden Fillmore, a.k.a. Jacqueline Darden

or Jacqueline Darden Allen

Date of Injury:

1/15/2021

Location of Accident:

Security Checkpoint of Terminal D, Philadelphia

International Airport

Dear Sir/Madam:

Please be advised that I represent Jacqueline D. Fillmore for injuries sustained in a fall that occurred on January 15, 2021 at the Philadelphia International Airport.

In accordance with the Federal Tort Claims Act and/or 42 Pa. C.S.A. §5522, we are serving you with a completed Claim Form SF 95 – Claim for Damage, Injury, or Death.

A copy of this Claim Form SF 95 was also served on the Office of Attorney General.

Please have this matter assigned to an investigator and/or claims representative with a request that they contact this office to further discuss.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Andrew Neuwirth /s/ Andrew T. Neuwirth, Esq.

ATN/sg Encl.

CLAIM FOR DAMAGE, INJURY, OR DEATH		INSTRUCTIONS: Please read carefully the instructions on the reverse side and supply information requested on both sides of this form. Use additional sheet(e) if necessary. See reverse side for additional instructions.		th sides of this se side for	FORM APPROVED OMB NO. 1105-0008			
1. Submit to Appropriate Federal Ager			<ol> <li>Name, address of claimant, and claimant's personal representative if any.</li> <li>(See Instructions on reverse). Number, Street, City, State and Zip code.</li> </ol>					
Claims Management Branch TSA(TSA -9) 601 South 12th Street Arlington, VA 20598-6009			Jacqueline Darden Fillmore, aka Jacqueline Darden or Jacqueline 144 Pine Street Dover, DE 19801					
571.227.1300								
tsaclaimsoffice@tsa.dhs.gov 3. TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT	4. DATE OF BIRTH	E. MARITAL STATUS 6. DATE AND DAY OF ACCIDENT 7. TIME (A.M. CF						
MILITARY X CIVILIAN	4/12/1952	Married 1/15/2021 - Friday				9:30 a.m.		
8. BASIS OF CLAIM (State in detail the the cause thereof. Use additional of	e known facts and circumsta	nces attending the di	emage, i	injury, or death, identifying persons	and property involv	ed, the piece of occurrence and		
Ms. Fillmore was required to flight. Knowing customers we hazard on its flooring. TSA, P slipping and falls and/or falled	euld be in socks or stock biladelobia International	ings, TŠA, Philad Airport and the C	elphia i City, Sta	international Airport, and other ate and Federal government	ers failed to preve failed to ensure m	nt a tripping or slipping lats were placed to prevent		
9.		PROPE	ERTY DA	MAGE				
NAME AND ADDRESS OF OWNER.	IF OTHER THAN CLAIMANT	(Number, Street, Ci	ty, Slate	, and Zip Code).				
PHL Terminal D - TSA	checkpoint							
BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE PROPERT (See instructions on reverse side).			ND THE	LOCATION OF WHERE THE PRO	OPERTY MAY BE IN	SPECTED.		
PHL Terminal D • TSA	checkpoint has unsafe f	looring						
10.		PERSONAL INJU	JRYAVR	ONGFUL DEATH				
STATE THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE INJURED PERSON OR DEC Tibial plateau fracture requin	EDENT.		ch for	MS THE BASIS OF THE CLAIM.	IF OTHER THAN CL	almant, state the name		
11. WITNESSES						•		
NAME				ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, and Zip Code)				
Investigation in ongoing. To I	pe provided.							
12. (See Instructions on reverse).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	AMOUNT O	F CLAIM	(in deliars)		***		
12a, PROPERTY DAMAGE	12b, PERSONAL INJURY			RONGFUL DEATH		to specify may cause		
Not applicable	Not applicable \$600,000.00		No	tapplicable \$600,000.00		ou ngus).		
I CERTIFY THAT THE AMOUNT OF CLAIM COVERS ONLY DAMAGES AND INJURIES CAUSED BY THE INCIDENT ABOVE AND AGREE TO ACCEPT SAID AMOUNT IN FULL SATISFACTION AND FINAL SETTLEMENT OF THIS CLAIM.								
					M 14. DATE OF SIGNATURE			
MAT	, Attorney for Claimant			215-259-3687 4/8/21				
CIVIL PENALTY FOR PRESENTING FRAUDULENT CLAIM				CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR PRESENTING FRAUDULENT CLAIM OR MAKING FALSE STATEMENTS				
The cishment is liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty of not less than \$5,000 and not more than \$10,000, plus 3 times the amount of damages sustained by the Government (See 21.11 S.C. 27.71).			Fino, imprisonment, or both. (See 18 U.S.C. 287, 1001.)					

INSURANCE	COVERAGE					
in order that subrogation claims may be adjudicated, it is essential that the claimant provide	e the following information regarding the insurance coverage of the vehicle or property.					
15. Do you carry socident insurance? Yes If yes, give name and address of insurance.  Not applicable	ance company (Number, Street, City, State, and Zip Code) and policy number. X					
16. Have you filed a cizim with your insurance carrier in this instance, and if so, is it full on	rerage or deductible? Yes No 17. If deductible, state amount.					
Not applicable						
18. If a claim has been fied with your carrier, what action has your insurer taken or propos	ed to take with reference to your claim? (it is necessary that you ascertain those facts).					
Not applicable						
18. Do you earry public liability and property damage insurance? Yes if yes, give n	ame and address of Insurance carrier (Number, Street, City, State, and Zip Code). No					
Not applicable						
Claims presented under the Federal Tort Claims Act should be SU	истюхв bmitted directly to the "appropriate Federal agency" whose more than one claimant, each claimant should submit a separate					
ciaim form.						
Complete all items - Insert the	e word NONE whore applicable.					
A CLAIM SHALL BE DEEMED TO HAVE BEEN PRESENTED WHEN A FEDERAL AGENCY RECEIVES FROM A CLAIMANT, HIS DULY AUTHORIZED AGENT, OR LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE, AN EXECUTED STANDARD FORM 65 OR OTHER WRITTEN NOTIFICATION OF AN INCIDENT, ACCOMPANIED BY A CLAIM FOR MONEY	DAMAGES IN A <u>SUM CERTAIN</u> FOR INJURY TO OR LOSS OF PROPERTY, PERSONAL INJURY, OR DEATH ALLEGED TO HAVE OCCURRED BY REASON OF THE INCIDENT. THE CLAIM MUST BE PRESENTED TO THE APPROPRIATE FEDERAL AGENCY WITHIN INVO YEARS AFTER THE CLAIM ACCRUES.					
Failure to completely execute this form or to supply the requested material within two years from the date the claim account may render your claim invalid. A claim is deemed presented when it is received by the appropriate agency, not when it is	The amount claimed should be substantiated by competent evidence as follows:  (a) In support of the claim for personal injury or death, the claimant should submit a					
malied,	written report by the attending physician, showing the nature and extent of the injury, the nature and extent of treatment, the degree of permanent disability, if any, the prognesis, and the period of hospitalization, or incapacitation, attaching itemized bills for medical, hospital, or burial expenses actually incurred.					
If instruction is needed in completing this form, the agency listed in item #1 on the reverse side may be contacted. Complete regulations pertaining to claims essented under the Federal Teri Claims act can be found in Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 14. Many seemics have published supplementing regulations. If more than one agency is involved, please stale each agency.	(b) in support of claims for damage to property, which has been or can be economically repaired, the claimant should submit at least two itemized signed statements or estimates by reliable, disinterested concerns, or, if payment has been made, the itemized signed receibts evidencing payment.					
The claim may be filled by a duly authorized agent or either togal representative, provided evidence satisfactory to the Government is submitted with the claim establishing express authority to act for the claimant. A claim presented by an agent or logal representative must be presented in the name of the claimant. If the claim is signed by the agent or legal representative, it must show the title or legal capacity of the person signing and be accompanied by avidence of his/her authority to present a claim on behalf of the claimant as agent, executor, administrator, perent, guardian or other representative.	(e) In support of claims for damage to property which is not economically repairable, or the property is lost or destroyed, the claimant should submit statements as to the origin cost of the property, the date of purchase, and the value of the property, both before an after the cocident. Such statements should be by disinterested competent persons, preferably reputable dealers or officials familiar with the type of property damaged, or b two or more compositive bidders, and should be certified as being just and correct.					
If claiment intends to file for both personal injury and property damage, the amount for each must be shown in learn number 12 of this form.	(d) Fallure to specify a sum certain will render your claim invalid and may result in forfeiture of your rights.					
PRIVACY ACT NOTICE						
This Notice is provided in accordance with the Privacy Act, 6 U.S.C. 552s(e)(3), and concerns the information requested in the latter to which this Notice is attached.  A Authority: The requested information is solicited pursuant to one or more of the following: 5 U.S.C. 301, 28 U.S.C. 501 et seq., 28 U.S.C. 2871 et seq., 28 C.F.R. Part 14.	B. Principal Purpose: The information requested is to be used in evaluating claims. C. Routine Use: See the Notices of Systems of Records for the agency to whom you are submitting this form for this information. D. Effect of Pakure to Respond: Disclosure is voluntary. However, failure to supply the requested information or to execute the form may render your claim "invaid."					

#### PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT NOTICE

This notice is saisty for the purpose of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 6 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and comploting and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Director, Torks Branch, Attention: Paperwork Reduction Staff, Civil Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530 or to the Office of Management and Budget. Do not mail completed form(s) to these addresses.



### U.S. Department of Justice

Civil Division, Torts Branch Federal Tort Claims Act Staff

Post Office Box 888 Benjamin Franklin Station Washington, D.C. 20044

GKJ:HLSwann:hls 157-0-32-55

May 10, 2021

Mr. Andrew T. Neuwirth Neuwirth Law Office, LLC A Personal Injury Law Firm 2200 Renaissance Boulevard Suite 270 King of Prussia, PA 19406

Re: Duplicate Administrative Tort Claims of Jacqueline Darden Fillmore

Dear Mr. Neuwirth:

This is in response to your client's duplicate administrative tort claims dated April 8, 2021, which you submitted to the Department of Justice (Department). The Department received the two claims on April 19, 2021, and April 20, 2021, respectively.

Because your client's duplicate claims concern an alleged tort involving the Transportation and Security Administration (TSA), within the Department of Homeland Security, I am forwarding the claims to that component. All further communication on this matter should be directed to the TSA at the address listed below.

Very truly yours,

HOPE L. SWANN Paralegal Specialist

Civil Division, Torts Branch

Hope L. Swann

cc: Ms. Mary Pendleton

Claims Management Office (TSA-9)

Transportation and Security Administration

601 South 12th Street, 8th Floor

Arlington, VA 20598

## **EXHIBIT B**



April 8, 2021

### Via First Class Mail & Certified Mail/RRR

City of Philadelphia 1515 Arch Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102

Attn: Risk Management Division/Claims Unit

RE: My Client:

Jacqueline Darden Fillmore, a.k.a. Jacqueline Darden

or Jacqueline Darden Allen

Date of Injury:

1/15/2021

Location of Accident:

Philadelphia International Airport

#### Dear Sir/Madam:

Please be advised that I represent Jacqueline D. Fillmore for injuries sustained in a fall that occurred on January 15, 2021 at the Philadelphia International Airport. In accordance with 42 Pa. C.S.A. §5522, the particulars of this incident are as follows:

- 1. Person injured and to whom cause of action has accrued: Jacqueline D. Fillmore
- 2. Address of person injured: 144 Pine Sreet, Dover, DE 19901
- 3. Date of Birth of person injured: 4/12/1952
- 4. Date and Hour of Accident: 1/15/21 at 9:30 AM
- 5. Location of Accident: Terminal D, TSA Checkpoint, Philadelphia International Airport
- 6. Treating Physician: Dr. Stephen Manifold of First State Orthopaedics
- 7. Injuries: Tibial plateau fracture with surgery
- 8. Cause of Accident: Failure to maintain safe premises, failure to use non-skid devices or applications at point of known danger, and failure to require safety measures. Flooring was defectively slippery. Floor mats not used where needed.

In addition to this letter, we are also enclosing a completed General Claim Information Form and Bodily Injury Claim Form.

Kindly assign this matter to an investigator and/or claims representative with a request that they contact this office to further discuss this case.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Andrew Neuwirth /s/ Andrew T. Neuwirth, Esq.

ATN/sg Encl.

### CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

RISK MANAGEMENT DIVISION - CLAIMS UNIT 1515 ARCH STREET - 14th FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102 PHONE (215) 683-1700

### GENERAL CLAIM INFORMATION FORM

GRITERALI CLIANIA	A I VALIMANA CALL
Jacqueline Darden Fillmore, ake Jacqueline Darden or NAME: Jacqueline Darden Allen	TODAY'S DATE:4/8/21
ADDRESS: 144 Pine Street, Dover, DE 19901	HOME TELEPHONE NUMBER: 302-270-8447
	WORK TELEPHONE NUMBER:
DATE OF BIRTH: 4/12/1952	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: 229-76-3930
DATE AND TIME OF THE ACCIDENT/INCIDENT:	01/15/2021 at approx. 9:30 AM
SPECIFIC LOSS LOCATION: Terminal D, TSA Checkp	point, Philadelphia International Airport
DESCRIPTION OF THE LOSS EVENTS BEING PRI PLEASE USE REVERSE SIDE OR ADDITIONAL SHEET OF PAPER IF MOD	ESENTED AGAINST THE CITY (IN DETAIL): RE ROOM IS NEEDED)
Claimant was caused to fall due to City's failure to maintain sa	afe premises, failure to use non-skid devices or applications at point
of known danger, and failure to require safety measures. Flor	oring was defectively slippery. Floor mats not used where needed.
VERIFICATION THAT THE POLICE WERE NOTIFY PLEASE PROVIDE THE POLICE REPORT DISTRICT NAME OF THE CITY DEPARTMENT INVOLVED: NAME OF THE CITY EMPLOYEE INVOLVED: CITY VEHICLE NUMBER OR TAG NUMBER: NAMES OF ANY KNOWN WITNESS (ES): To be ADDRESS AND/OR PHONE NUMBER OF THE WI	CT CONTROL NUMBER: 2021-77000211  Philadelphia Airport  Not applicable  provided - pending investigation
<ul> <li>A COPY OF YOUR INSURANCE DECLARATION SIENTHE LOSS DESCRIPTION. THE CITY WILL PROAFTER SUBMITTING THIS LOSS.</li> <li>TWO WRITTEN ESTIMATES FOR THE REPAIR/REID PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE DEFECTIVE CONDITION</li> <li>PROVIDE A COPY OF VEHICLE REGISTRATION.</li> </ul>	CAUSING THE LOSS AND YOUR DAMAGED PROPERTY.  ITH THIS FORM BECOMES PROPERTY OF THE CITY OF
ANY PERSON WHO KNOWINGLY AND WITH INTENT TO DEFRA PERSON FILES AN APPLICATION FOR INSURANCE OR STATEM	ding information concerning any fact material thereto,
SIGNATURE: Andrew Neuwirth, Esq. /s/, Attorney for C	laimant
4	

BODILY INJURY CLAIM FORM ATTACHMENT
CLAIMANT INFORMATION
DID YOU RECEIVE EMERGENCY MEDICAL TREATMENT?XYESNO IF YES, WHERE WERE YOUR TREATED: Methodist Hospital-Jefferson Health, Philadelphia, PA
WERE YOU PROVIDED MEDICAL TRANSPORT: X YESNO
WERE YOU HOSPIȚALIZED AS A RESULT OF THIS LOSS:YESNO IF YES, WHERE WERE YOU HOSPITALIZED:Bayheaith Hospital, Milford, DE HOW LONG WERE YOU HOSPITLAIZED:5 days (1/28/21 to 2/2/21)
PLEASE PROVIDE THE NAME AND ADDRESS OF YOUR TREATING PHYSICIAN:  Dr. Stephen Manifold of First State Orthopsedics, 285 Besier Bivd., Suite 201, Dover, DE 19904
PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INJURY (IES) FOR WHICH YOU WERE TREATED:  Tiblal Plateau Fracture requiring surgery
WAS FOLLOW UP TREATMENT RECOMMENDED?  IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE: Physical therapy and rehab.
PLEASE PROVIDE THE TOTAL DURATION OF YOUR TREATMENT DATE STARTED: 1/15/2021
DISCHARGE DATE: Claimant is still treating. (IF TREATMENT IS ON GOING, PLEASE INDICATE)
IN ADDITION TO COMPLETING THIS FORM, PLEASE PROVIDE THIS OFFICE WITH THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION  • INFORMATION REGARDING YOUR INSURANCE COVERAGE (AUTOMOBILE, HEALTH INSURANCE OR ANY  OTHER AVAILABLE COVERAGE). IF YOU HAVE NO INSURANCE PLEASE INDICATE THAT IN THE LOSS  DESCRIPTION. THE CITY WILL PROVIDE AN AFFIDAVIT OF NO INSURANCE TO BE NOTARIZED AFTER SUBMITTING THIS LOSS.
<ul> <li>COPIES OF ALL MEDICAL REPORTS, MEDICAL BILLS AND DOCTOR'S NARRATIVES.</li> <li>NOTE: ALL DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED WITH THIS FORM BECOMES PROPERTY OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, AND ARE NON-RETURNABLE</li> </ul>
Fraud Warning Any Person who knowingly and with intent to defraud any insurance company, municipality or any other Person files an application for insurance or statement of claim containing any materially false Information or conceals for the purpose of misleading information concerning any fact material thereto, commits a fraudulent insurance act, which is a crime and subjects such person to criminal and civil Penalties.
SIGNATURE: Andrew Neuwirth, Esq. /s/, Attorney for Claimant DATE: 4/8/21